

Remarks

In the Office Action, claims 2 and 3 were objected to because of the following informalities: the above claims are informal in that they contain the following terms lacking clear antecedent basis:

1. "said powdered material" (claim 2, line 1)
2. "said contact medium" (claim 3, line 1).

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to indicate that the "receptacle" contains a powdered material or a contact medium. No new matter was added. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 3 are no longer subject to rejection.

In the Office Action, the application was rejected to on the basis of double patenting as follows:

Claims 1-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent N. 6,444,165. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims allow for the more narrowly defined copper material (copper fibers of claim 3 of the '165 patent) or the overlapping ceramic materials for the receptacles (tubes) of instant claims 1 and 7.

A Terminal Disclaimer has been included herewith. Thus, the application is no longer subject to a double patenting rejection.


It should be noted that claim 6 is cancelled, and thus, claim 7 cannot be objected to.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it will be noted that a sincere attempt has been made to place this application in condition for allowance.

Therefore, reexamination and reconsideration are requested and allowance solicited at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.
27901



Andrew Alexander
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27690
Telephone (724) 337-1566